



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

valuable. Linguistic and other material is given in supplements, so as not to burden the main text. Many of the footnotes are illuminating. The author has a genuine enthusiasm for his subject and has produced a highly satisfactory book.

JOHN C. GRANBERY

PHILIPPI, W. VA.

THE ORIGIN OF NEW TESTAMENT BOOKS

In this discussion¹ the author has two problems in mind: the relation of Mark to the First and Third Gospels, and the question of Mark's sources. By an examination of the Second Gospel section by section Goguel concludes that Mark in practically its present form was used in the composition of Matthew and Luke. The more difficult question of Mark's source materials is decided in favor of the composite theory. To give an illustration in detail, it is held that in the account of the Passion the evangelist drew upon five sources of information: (1) The story of Peter's denial, and the substance of the Gethsemane incident, were from reminiscences of Peter. (2) Some anonymous account of the trial and death of Jesus supplied 14:1 f., 10 f., 43-50; 15:1-15, 21-32, 37a, 40-16:8. This was a very old element of tradition and Mark may not have known it as a source distinct from that of Peter's reminiscences. (3) Slightly later traditions furnished other details. (4) The Logia contributed the prediction of Judas' treachery, and perhaps the story of the institution of the Last Supper. (5) Lastly, there were items contributed by the evangelist himself or by tradition which arose near to his time, such as the preparation for the Passover, the flight of the young man, and details added to the other four sources.

In contending for Mark's acquaintance with the Logia, some interesting observations are presented. This is a point that seems to be gaining favor with critical scholars. With Mark 1:7 f. the use of this source begins. As compared with the other synoptists, the priority of Mark 1:1-6 is thought to be evident, but in the two following verses Matthew and Luke prove to be the earlier. Mark took this messianic prophecy from the Logia, and his purpose was to fix the relation between Jesus and John. Thus he shows his interest in the early polemic against John's disciples.

Goguel is no rigid adherent of the two-document theory; he thinks there were important sources other than the Logia available for Mark. From

¹ *L'évangile de Marc et ses rapports avec ceux de Mathieu et de Luc: Essai d'une introduction critique à l'étude du second évangile.* (Bibliothèque de l'École des hautes études. Sciences religieuses, Vol. XXII.) Par Maurice Goguel. Paris: Leroux, 1909. 348 pages.

one of these the apocalyptic discourse of Jesus as it now stands in chap. 13 was derived. This part of Mark was worked over, perhaps by the evangelist himself, from five to ten years after its first appearance. Allowance also is to be made for other redactions. It is held that the gospel appeared about 65 A.D., between 70 and 75 the synoptic apocalypse was added, between 75 and 85 further modifications and additions were made. Thus the Second Gospel owes its present form to reminiscences of Peter, fragments from the Logia source, miscellaneous items of tradition, and editorial and redactional touches.

The main outlines of this discussion remind us of Loisy's views, but the author tells us that his conclusions were formulated before Loisy's work appeared. Footnotes have been used freely in referring to other workers in this field; but Goguel has exercised an independent judgment throughout, and his remarks are stimulating if not always convincing. In the nature of the case arguments for the recovery of source elements in Mark are liable to be somewhat subjective, yet it is significant that so much attention has been given to the problem in the last few years. The theory of its composite character seems to be growing in favor.

These three bulky volumes² from one who is a recognized champion of traditional views cannot fail to arouse interest. Of all the author's works in the New Testament field, this is the best one to use in introducing him to English readers. It reflects, on the one hand, his interpretation of early Christian tradition, and, on the other, his exegetical method as applied to the New Testament books themselves. The task of translation, which must have been exceedingly onerous, has been well done. Except for a few infelicitous renderings, and several typographical errors, the work is quite as readable in its English dress as in the German.

The plan is in most respects that usually followed in such works. An exceptionally large amount of space is given to footnotes. These display a wide range of information, but it is not so evident that they always prove the point in question or even that they are always pertinent to it. The conclusions of contemporary scholarship are not given the attention one would expect in so extended a treatise. In fact there is an unpleasant tendency to dismiss opposing views with an epithet or with a derogatory

² *Introduction to the New Testament*. By Theodor Zahn. Translated from the third German edition by J. M. Trout, W. A. Mather, L. Hodous, E. S. Worcester, W. H. Worrell, and R. B. Dodge, under the direction and supervision of M. W. Jacobus, assisted by C. S. Thayer. In three volumes. New York: Scribner, 1909. Vol. I, xviii + 564 pages; Vol. II, viii + 617 pages; Vol. III, viii + 539 pages.

comment; they are "pure inventions," "dogmatic prejudices," "arbitrary assumptions," due to the perverted "taste" of "critics" who are "not open to conviction" but are lacking in "historical sense," and who would "convict of ignorance" the New Testament writer, or accuse him of "forgery" and "deceitful intentions," or charge him with "thoughtless indolence" and impugn his "intellectual and moral character." Zahn seems to hold it as a major premise that those who criticize traditional opinions do so primarily for apriori reasons and altogether without the support of any facts.

In the whole construction the author is guided by two general principles, one showing itself in his treatment of the external evidence and the other appearing in his interpretation of the New Testament writers. The first is his conception of the origin and growth of the canon idea. As would be expected from his earlier works, he assumes, in contrast with Harnack for instance, that the idea of authoritative Christian writings took shape at a very early date. So he can argue that the prestige of James the brother of Jesus not only makes it altogether probable that he wrote the so-called Epistle of James but also makes it improbable that any later writer would be successful in impersonating him. Similarly the abrupt ending of Mark 16:8 must be due to a sudden interruption of the evangelist. Had he written more it would have been too highly prized to be lost either by accident or by deliberate substitution. Proceeding upon this line of argument it is easy to deny the very possibility of pseudonymity for any New Testament book. If, on the other hand, the canon idea did not come to full consciousness until the second century, and then largely through the influence of the Roman church in controversy with heresy, such reasoning as the above falls to the ground. One who finds Zahn's views on the canon untenable will not be able to follow him here.

The second noticeable feature of his work is a forced exegetical method. He pronounces finally upon problems of exegesis without sufficient evidence. He is willing to say that the superlative (*πρῶτον*) in Acts 1:1 makes it certain that Luke had definitely in mind the writing of a third book. But such nicety in the usage of comparative and superlative in the vernacular Greek of the New Testament period is not supported by the facts thus far known. It is likewise unsafe to affirm emphatically, as Zahn does, that the singular and plural in the third person are always to be sharply distinguished in Paul's thought, or that the genitive is always subjective in Paul's phrase "gospel of Christ." Examples of this labored exegetical method on a larger scale, are seen in the argument for genuineness drawn from the internal evidence of II Peter and of Jude.

Zahn's contribution to the principal problems of New Testament introduction is not so large as one could wish. Many critical difficulties receive scant attention. For example, doubts about the authorship of the Pastoral Epistles are scarcely taken seriously. In fact the genuineness of all New Testament writings ascribed by tradition to Paul is virtually decided upon by a series of general considerations quite apart from the examination of the individual letters (I, 156-62). But the author does not spare words when the subject seems to him worth while, nor does he withhold the expression of his opinion on even the most disputed points. He believes Galatians was written to the southern group of churches, and was sent from Corinth soon after Paul's first arrival there. This would be early in the year 53, according to Zahn's chronology. Ephesians, written from Rome, was not addressed to any particular church but was a circular letter intended for various congregations in Asia. Other problems of the Pauline writings are answered in the usual traditional way. First Peter is thought to have been written from Rome in the year 64. Silvanus was immediately responsible for the composition, but he wrote under Peter's instructions though not at his dictation. The Pauline ideas in the letter, "when considered without prejudice," are proof of the letter's authenticity. Appollos is the probable author of Hebrews. The letter was written shortly before the year 90 and was intended for a Jewish congregation attached to some household in Rome.

The discussion of the gospels is perhaps the most unsatisfactory part of this whole work. Of course the author wrote before the numerous recent discussions bearing on the synoptic problem came out, but it is regrettable that he did not prepare for the translators a fresh revision of this part of his book. To be sure, the discussion of this topic was not up to date when it first appeared in the German work. We are told that the earliest written gospel document was the Gospel of Matthew composed at first in Aramaic but in content identical with the present Greek gospel. In its Aramaic form it circulated somewhat widely and was used in the gentile church where it was orally rendered into Greek. Later the Gospel of Mark appeared, written in Greek but considerably influenced by the author's knowledge of Matthew. Still later Matthew was put into Greek, the translator using Mark as an aid in his task. Matthew appeared in 61-66, Mark in 66 or 67, Luke and Acts between 70 and 80. The third evangelist was Luke, the companion of Paul. He used Mark as a source, but did not use Matthew or any other document prepared by an eyewitness. In writing the apostolic history he did not consult Paul's letters for information; yet alleged discrepancies between Acts and the writings of Paul are

held to be largely imaginary. The originality of the β text is accepted, so Luke appears personally on the scene as early as Acts 11:25. Zahn almost entirely fails to relate himself to the investigation which has been going on steadily in this field for the last half-century. To say that "Matthew's dependence on older written sources cannot be demonstrated," and that "evidence convincing to one who does not already believe the point proved has not been produced," is not an adequate reason for setting aside some of the best attested results of synoptic study today.

The books traditionally connected with the name of John are all treated as genuine works of the apostle, and are assigned to the years 80-95. The distinct style of Revelation is explained by the unique circumstances of the writer: here he wrote as a Christian prophet under the special inspiration of the spirit, while he composed the gospel and epistles in a more normal state of mind. In this connection we recall a comment of one of Zahn's German contemporaries to the effect that if this be true John did a better piece of work than the spirit did. No real contradictions between the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptics is admitted, not even is it conceded that they differ in their representations of the day of the week on which Jesus was crucified. Though reproducing the discourses of Jesus with freedom, for essential historical truth John is thought to be more reliable than any other gospel.

To say the least, it is unfortunate that Zahn's treatment does not better represent the results of modern scholarship in this field of New Testament study. This is all the more regrettable in a work now prepared distinctly for English readers, inasmuch as comprehensive discussions of the subject are scarce in this language. Moreover the defensive attitude of the writer tends to divert attention from some more important matters. We venture to suggest that the kind of introduction most needed today is a work that will aim primarily to give the reader an insight into the religious life and spirit of the age which produced the New Testament literature. This is the only type of *introduction* that is likely to issue in an appreciative *acquaintanceship*.

SHIRLEY JACKSON CASE

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

STUDIES IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

More than half a century ago Holtzmann was a pupil of Rothe and Vatke and learned then the principles which he has ever since used in his assiduous study of the New Testament. His publications on New Testament literature and theology have long been among the most stimulating and useful of the helps accessible to students. All must share with him